

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN RE: ASBESTOS PRODUCTS : Consolidated Under
LIABILITY LITIGATION (No. VI) : MDL DOCKET NO. 875

VARIOUS PLAINTIFFS :

FILED

11-63482

v.

MAR 19 2012

VARIOUS DEFENDANTS :

Cases listed in Exhibit "A,"
attached

MICHAEL E. KUNZ, Clerk
By _____ Dep. Clerk

O R D E R

AND NOW, this 16th day of **March, 2012**, it is hereby **ORDERED**
that Defendants' Motions listed in Exhibit "A," attached, are
GRANTED as unopposed.¹

AND IT IS SO ORDERED.



EDUARDO C. ROBRENO, J.

¹ Plaintiffs have not opposed Defendants' motions, including motions for summary judgment. As provided under local rules, for motions for summary judgment, the Court must independently determine that the moving party is entitled to judgment as a matter of law. See Loc. R. Civ. P. 7.1(c).

The bases for Defendants' motions is that Plaintiffs have failed to raise a genuine issue of material fact as to whether decedent's asbestos-related injuries were caused by products manufactured, supplied, or distributed by these Defendants.

Based on the uncontested evidence presented by Defendants, the Court concludes that these Defendants are entitled to judgment as a matter of law.

EXHIBIT "A"

Anderson, 11-63482: OI's Motion for Summary Judgment (Doc #270)

Gehrt, 08-92066: OI's Motion for Summary Judgment (Doc #170)

Goeken, 10-68122: OI's Motion for Summary Judgment (Doc #116)

Krik, 11-63473: OI's Motion for Leave to File Reply (Doc #275)